his ltr PMT

9/27/69

Dear Dick,

Your 9/19 didn't arrive until yesterday. It is full of goodies and questions, for all of which I do not at this moment have sufficient time.

What you say of the ~~xxxxxxxxx~~ back wound is correct, with one qualification: they didn't "accidently" mix up their samples, when they removed tissues for study from the cadaver. I am willing to believe this could have been a hit to the back as late as right before the fatal shot(s).

What you say of the exterior neck wound is based upon a military bullet rather than a frangible type, isn't it? It could not have been thus if the bullet had been one designe to explode, mushroom, or in any way come apart. I think you have a handgun on the "fibres of the shirt", for there is no evidence the damage to it or the tie came from the projectile and every reason to believe this was cut at the hospital. Or have you come around to this belief? There is not even a "whisper" there was an exit at this point.

Have you any pictures of the South side manhole other than Prague's? You describe what I do not recall from them. There was an official interest in this. Memory tricks, but I believe this is in Dulles' questioning of Hoover, about 5H100-1. The debirs visible in the photo showing debris is shaped like a .45 slug. If it were brain matter, I have difficulty believing the unidentified agent would have tried to taken it with his bare hand. Agreed with your questioning. But are you here saying that when a bullet explodes, the force is directed only in the direction of the projectile, or all the strong force is? I agree this is an important thing for Gary to carry forward, for he is no hof man. I ran out of time when I was in Dulles. Let me caution you, probably unnecessarily, do not cut off from or turn off, for with his specter-like perspectives, he'll get from the Archives the kind of cooperation we cannot.

I will be interested in seeing how you carry our cartridge-case knowledge forward. Sorry it took me so long to make the tests for you, but I couldn't justify the expenditure on a good shooting ~~xxxx~~ rig.

Nichols has not told me of the old brief but says the complete one is not yet ready (letter received yesterday, response enclosed).

Saul

~~Xxxx~~ is waiting receipt of Dick before mailing Frazier with it. Bud is now in ... and I've asked ... k to get other transcripts, including Shaneyfelt. On consulting Hodek and others: before you were here I'd located, besides him, three ~~xxx~~ "masters". When we have completed all this will, I think, be the time to speak to them. At least one of these, like Hodey, works for the federal government, a possible complication... Agreed on the core work...I wonder, if you recall, whether Tink had a base picture taken that he didn't use?

My confusion on frangible bullets comes from my belief, until you corrected me, that they were plastic only.

On the JFK movements, I presume you have an 8 mm projector on which you can stop safely. However, there is added knowledge to be gained by using the Archives slides, for they show JFK in two adjacent slides. I had been a long time since I used

my initial studies, indicated in WWII. Probably it was about April 1966. When I took Sciambra there in the late winter of 1968, my recollections were pretty good, especially on the discontinuity of the backward and leftward movements. Then I discovered that, in apparent response to my cracks in PM, they had added the nine unpublished frames and I studied them at some length, introducing new knowledge and new confusion. There also was a time when a lot came a deal for someone to make new slides from each frame of the copy Marcus had, but he backed out on it. So, much of the work I'd planned to do with slides I cannot because I cannot take time to take an artist to the library. There is an artist in Boston I'll be able to use if I can get this sequence on slides. I've asked Gary for the 192-205 sequence for a similar purpose having to do with the first shot and Zilvia. To return to your comment on Frazier's correctness re: 313, I cannot reconcile this with the failure of the relatively easily moved head to react to the tremendous energy of a blow from the rear. I do not believe there was any head snapping between 313 and 316. My study of 314, for example, also showed 316 in the same slide. In motion this whole thing is fast, but when it is examined in slides the effect is different. I do not recall the Parkland testimony he had a bruise on the outside of the chest. I'd want to read this if you recall its source (I recall testimony about contusion inside that may have been from the surgery rather than the projectile). You may be right in all of this, but I believe the pivoting neednot show the shot was from the right. He pivots both ways. One way you can see the back of his neck, and there is no visible blood any more. Then he goes the other way as he goes down.

Can you see "great pieces of febris fly forward" at 313? To me this is a mist of fine tissues and blood. Would not the first, or counter-clockwise pivoting, be accounted for with the force, i.e, the shot, originating on the left? Lane has locked too many of us in to a north grassy knoll presumption because he got mileage out of shooting around, but there is nothing at all to preclude a shot from the knoll on the south side and much that argues it as the more desirable-certainly the safer-place....Is it physically possible for the chin to strike the chest hard enough to bruise? I cannot do it...I do not see anything like the force of a shot propelling JFK backward against the seat at 318, and the force would have been such that a single frame would have recorded it. And I see no counterforce exerted by the springs of the back of the seat.

Clearly, there is too much here we do not know and cannot, on the basis of the present state of our knowledge, be absolutely without question about... The Hoffman ringing-brain theory is ridiculous. What a kick that recoiling brain would have made!...I'll be glad to make no public mention of this. I'd prefer it be his cherished "a cret".

If and when you see Dempsey, in addition to the obvious, without focusing his interest or suspicion, ask him for everything you can get (and tape, be sure) about Miguel Alvarez Jiminez, Antonio Soto Vasquez and Acela Pedros Amores (perhaps Pedor Acela). Also one Gonzjo or (phon) Gonsesly-o or Gonzilly-o). Skip around and come back to these to be sure, if he knows anything, you do not unduly emphasize interest or arouse his suspicions. It is possible these could be very important.

Councilman: I have gotten only the one copy, dated 7/15. I am still interested in anything further they may have carried on the King bug ing or the Clay case...Garrison once had a great interest in an Emilio Santana.

Gotta get to other things. Valuable letter. Many thanks.

Best,

Harold Weisberg